. Charles Seminary Library
Carthagena, Ohio
JUN 4 '60

Catholic Editors and Senator Kennedy
— An Exchange of Views

THE

Commonweal

America on Trial

The Challenges We Face

by Donal O'Mahony

A Peaceful Army

Negroes on the March

by Nat Hentoff

THE SUN ALSO SETS . . . . . by Edward Seidensticker
FROM A BOOK OF HOURS: A POEM . . . . . by Carol Johnson
BERTOLT BRECHT . . . . . by Bruce A. Cook
STOLPE'S NIGHT MUSIC . . . . . by Michael Novak
STALINIZATION IN THE U.S. . . . . by Michael Harrington

lume LXXII, No. 11 June 10, 1960 Twenty-Five Cents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Founded 1789

SUMMER SCHOOL

First Session—June 15-July 23
Second Session—July 26-Sept. 2

CHRISTIAN POLITICAL THEORY
(June 20-July 1)

CRITICISM: DRAMATIC FOCUS
(July 11-22)

WRITERS CONFERENCE
(Aug. 8-19)

Air Conditioned Classrooms

Co-Educational
Graduate and Undergraduate Courses

Accounting	Government
Astronomy	History
Biology	Linguistics
Business Administration	Mathematics
Chemistry	Nursing
Economics	Philosophy
English	Physics
Geography	Theology

European, Mid-Eastern and Oriental Languages

For complete catalog or information:

DIRECTOR OF SUMMER SCHOOL
36th & N Streets, N. W., Washington 7, D. C.
Federal 7-3300

THIS WEEK

Week by Week 267

America on Trial
by Donal O'Mahony 271

No Room at the Top
by John Cogley 274

A Peaceful Army
by Nat Hentoff 275

From a Book of Hours: A Poem
by Carol Johnson 278

The Screen
by Philip T. Hartung 279

"Catholic Editors and Senator Kennedy"
An Exchange of Views 280

Of Note: Gambling and the Law
by Albert Cardinal Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago 281

The Sun Also Sets
by Edward Seidensticker 283

Books 284

THE COMMONWEAL
386 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK 16

Editor
EDWARD S. SKILLIN

Managing Editor
JAMES O'GARA

Associate Editors
JAMES FINN
RICHARD HORCHLER

Drama Critic: RICHARD HAYES; *Movie Critic:* PHILIP T. HARTUNG; *Paris:* ROBERT BARRAT; *Rome:* GUNNAR D. KUMLIEN; *Great Britain:* MICHAEL P. FOGARTY

JOHN BRUBAKER: *Advertising Manager*

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Orange, Conn., under the act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the U.S.A. and published weekly, except biweekly during July and August, at 440 Post Road, Orange, Conn., by The Commonweal Publishing Co., Inc., 386 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N.Y. MUrray Hill 3-9685.

Copyright © 1960 The Commonweal Publishing Co., Inc.
U. S. and Canada, $8 a year. Foreign, $10. Single copies 25¢
Printed at the Wilson H. Lee Co., Orange, Conn.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE
Commonweal
A Weekly Review of Public Affairs, Literature, and the Arts
THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR OF PUBLICATION

week by week

WHAT NOW?

EVIDENCE mounts that those elements which regard aggressiveness as the surest way to Communist world domination have recently come to exert greater influence in the Kremlin. The absence of Mr. Mikoyan and the prominence of Marshal Malinovsky supply one clue. The truculent reaction of Foreign Minister Gromyko at the U.N. to President Eisenhower's sober address to the nation on the summit failure provides another—even if pitched several degrees in violence below the Khrushchev outburst in Paris. The return of Mr. Molotov and the increasing influence of the Chinese Communists point in a similar, hard-line direction. Difficulties with dustbowls and in certain sectors of Russian heavy industry may be partly responsible for the pressures on Khrushchev, as well as the U-2 incident's revelation to all the world of the penetrability of the Soviets' supposedly impregnable aerial defenses. But in any case the Khrushchev thesis, emphasized during the past eighteen months, that the West can be overcome simply through peaceful competition—by means of superior Soviet education and economic and cultural penetration—is giving way to more Stalinist assumptions.

How would the Soviets' stepping up of the cold war affect American policy and what does this immediate prospect mean for the free world? What should America do now? The threefold program outlined by President Eisenhower appears highly persuasive in its general outlines. Assuredly this is an occasion for strengthening our defenses; at the same time it is important to maintain all feasible contacts with the Communist world, and to continue negotiating on such vital matters as the nuclear test ban and disarmament; finally, the United States should do everything possible to improve living conditions in the world.

On this latter point the President's declaration that "the zigs and zags of the Kremlin cannot be allowed to disturb our worldwide programs and purposes," seems particularly well phrased. The only question here is whether he conceives the implementation of this idea on a scale that is sufficiently extensive.

THE PROBLEM of keeping up our guard has been made more difficult by what happened at Paris. One aim of Mr. Khrushchev's raging may well have been to quash any chance of our resuming those unstoppable U-2 flights over Soviet territory. That closes out one effective means of spotting new installations for Russian I.C.B.M.'s, presumably equipped with nuclear warheads and aimed at the principal cities, industrial complexes and airbases of the United States. It is believed that the U.S.S.R. is attempting to increase sixfold its present stock of thirty-odd such missiles by the end of this year. To compensate for the assurance of additional secrecy Khrushchev may have gained for this crash program from his stormy Paris performance is the heightened unity of purpose he effected in the NATO powers, together with the bad impression he has made on many other countries.

But the outmoding of the Distant Early Warning and other radar systems designed to give six hours notice of a take-off from the U.S.S.R. of manned bombers headed our way, plus the new limitations on aerial reconnaissance, will thrust into new prominence our powers of thermonuclear retaliation, as the principal deterrent against surprise attack. Yet even here it will be of paramount importance for the S.A.C. to keep informed on the location of its targets.

If the risk of their own wholesale devastation can still be counted on to restrain the Soviets from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deliberately launching a thermonuclear attack, that does not mean that they will go after their objectives any less strenuously by other means: subversion, internal revolutions and little wars carried on by satellites in a world already seething with unrest. This country and our allies must be prepared to meet such eventualities.

Mr. Eisenhower painted a telling contrast between the accessibility to all, including Soviet agents, of all sorts of information about America. But it is curious that not once has the President seemed to perceive the connection between this country's openness and the U.S.S.R.'s iron secrecy and the invariable Russian rejection of his "open skies" proposals. If the Soviets are already fully informed as to the location and character of our military bases, major transportation facilities and defense plants, for example, what substantial new information would the results of aerial inspection over our country have to offer them? On the other hand, such reconnaissance over Soviet Russia aided by the latest photographic techniques could reveal much and supply assurance to the free world against surprise attack. Our willingness to permit U.N. flights over all our territory betokens our own peaceful intentions, but the "open skies" idea is anathema to the Kremlin.

There appears to be less Soviet opposition to the President's plea for continuing businesslike negotiations toward goals that would be mutually advantageous. And what could be more ardently desired by governments and people on both sides of the Iron Curtain than the slowing down and eventually stopping of the missile and nuclear arms race? If both sides remain alert, there is slim likelihood of either one's gaining overweening superiority. The mounting burden of armaments means increasing human deprivation; the destructive capabilities of the weapons now on hand is beyond all imagining. That is why negotiations on controls must be pursued on all feasible levels despite repeated setbacks. There, at least, is a tangible common goal for both sides in the cold war and for the rest of the world as well.

NOT SO DARK HORSES

SOME six weeks ago we wrote of "two little clouds" on the 1960 political horizon, one signifying Adlai Stevenson's claim to serious consideration as Democratic Presidential nominee, the other representing Nelson Rockefeller's identical claim on the opposing ticket. Since that time a great deal has happened, at home and abroad, but the situation remains the same in regard to these two almost-candidates. If anything, the clouds are even a trifle larger than they were.

To be sure, the past few weeks brought Senator Kennedy his impressive victory in the West Virginia primary, a victory which strengthened his position as front-runner for the Democratic nomination, eliminated Senator Humphrey from the race altogether and did much to reduce the valuation of the "religious issue" as a factor in Mr. Kennedy's "availability" as a candidate. On the other hand, these past few weeks have also brought the U-2 affair, the summit fiasco and the consequent deterioration of U.S.-Soviet relations. The emergence of foreign affairs as a dominant campaign issue has enhanced the attractiveness of Mr. Stevenson as a Democratic candidate, by reason of his maturity, past experience and widely known views in the area of international affairs. Moreover, Mr. Stevenson has taken the lead in Democratic response to the U-2 mishap, and his encouraged followers have renewed their efforts in his behalf.

As for Mr. Rockefeller, the fact that he has been openly critical of the Eisenhower Administration's foreign policies has redounded to his credit in the public mind. He has, furthermore, emphasized his differences with the now limping Administration by remarkably forthright and critical statements. Vice President Nixon, of course, has no choice but to identify himself with Eisenhower policies and hope that his new-old "hard anti-Communist line" will serve him as well now as it did some years ago. The pressure on Governor Rockefeller to endorse his Party's "inevitable" candidate undoubtedly grows stronger every day, but thus far he shows no signs of yielding.

The possibility of twin upsets at the forthcoming conventions is not really large, it must be said, but it remains firmly that—a possibility at least. As Mr. Nixon is forced to trade more and more on the fact that Premier Khrushchev sees him as a "goat in the cabbage patch," Governor Rockefeller becomes more and more attractive to the Republican Party's moderate and liberal members. And as the Kennedy bandwagon picks up speed, the unconvinced supporters of other Democratic candidates find themselves drifting willy-nilly into the ranks of Stevenson admirers. Senator Kennedy must now be counted the clear favorite for the Democratic nomination, and Mr. Nixon's defeat for the Republican nomination would seem to require a near-miracle . . . and yet, as we said, there are still those little clouds.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMMUNISTS AND CUBA

CUBA CONTINUES her tortured path toward an increasingly uncertain and possibly frightening future. The Castro revolution, which roused hopes and aspirations as high as the ideals it proclaimed, has declined into the Castro regime, which has fostered confusion and distrust. Many of Premier Castro's acts, even apart from his crude anti-U.S. attacks, are regrettable and properly subject to severe criticism. Further, while many key policies are as admirable as when they were first enunciated, the increased official association of these policies with Communist policies has worked to divide the country.

The pastoral letter recently issued by Archbishop Perez Serantes of Santiago has not, therefore, created an issue so much as it has intensified and clarified an issue that already existed. Many people, Cubans and non-Cubans, have grown increasingly concerned about the role being given to or being taken over by the Communists in Cuba. Some of these people charged that the revolution was being subverted by Communist influence. Castro countered by declaring anti-Communism a counter-revolutionary diversion.

The Archbishop's statement, which reiterated the condemnation of Catholic cooperation with Communists, will make it difficult for many Cubans to accept Castro's statement. For the Archbishop enunciated once again the opposition of the Catholic Church to Communism. To avoid suggesting a repudiation of Castro's regime, Archbishop Perez Serantes praised several aspects of the revolutionary government. But his condemnation of cooperation with Communists stresses and heightens the struggle taking place within Cuba.

CATHOLICS AND SCHOOL BUDGETS

THE RELATIONSHIP between public and parochial schools continues to cause more religious tensions in various American communities than it should. There are, of course, many reasons for this state of affairs, but one important factor is the oft-repeated charge that in practice parents of parochial school children consistently oppose increased expenditures for the public schools, no matter how many "official" Catholic statements of support for the public schools may be issued. For this reason, the results of two studies made recently on this question in the state of New York are significant and conclusive.

In New York, 1959 was a year of taxpayer revolt. School budgets were defeated by the voters in an unprecedented thirty-four districts, fifteen in Nassau and Suffolk counties on fast-growing Long Island. Charges were made in the wake of these budget defeats that Catholic taxpayers whose children were in parochial schools were primarily responsible. As a result of these complaints, a thorough investigation was ordered by the State Education Department.

For the sake of study, each of the New York districts whose budgets were voted down was paired with a neighboring district which had no record of budget defeats, and the paired districts were then studied from the point of view of the percentage of children attending parochial schools. Although complete details are not yet available, the general conclusion of the study is summed up in a statement by its director that "there is nothing in the statistics that shows any relationship between parochial-school enrollments and budget defeats."

At almost the same time, the results of a smaller, independent study along similar lines were released at a meeting of school superintendents from seventy school districts in New York. Carried out by the principal of a public high school, this analysis covered eighteen school districts on Long Island, where feelings on the issue ran very high last year. Although cautioning that his study was relatively small in scope and hence able to present only "indications, not conclusions," the author of the second study arrived at essentially the same findings as those in the investigation carried out by the state. What is popularly called the "Catholic vote," he said, plays little if any part in the determination of school budgets. In only one circumstance, according to his study, was it possible that the proportion of children in the parochial school did come into the picture: when both the parochial and the public schools were expanding rapidly at the same time, there was some indication of resistance by Catholic voters to increased public school budgets. This point was not conclusive, and how much this factor counted in budget defeats if it did exist was also not clear, but it was the only hint at correlation that could be found, and the author of the study noted that if true it would only show that Catholic parents sometimes find it hard to pay for expanding the parochial school while at the same time paying higher public school taxes.

Aside from this one possible exception, both studies emphasize that there are many factors at work in school budget elections, with such considerations as the proportion of one-family homes on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the one hand and industries and apartment buildings on the other as far more significant in the outcome of budget battles than the number of children in religious schools. No one should be so foolish, of course, as to claim on the basis of these studies that at no time in no place will parents with children in parochial schools say or do foolish things when public school budgets are up for consideration—just as one should not assume that each and every school budget is so sacrosanct that no one should ever vote against it. But the two New York studies should destroy the easy assumption that the "Catholic vote" is automatically responsible whenever public school budgets are defeated here, there and everywhere.

A CHANGING SYMBOL

IF PRESIDENT Eisenhower does make his trip to Japan, he may encounter more than the difficulties promised by the Socialist Party in that country. In fact, unless he changes his plans, he may become embroiled in something suspiciously like a Church-State problem.

In his plans for the proposed visit of June 20, President Eisenhower had included a visit to the Shinto Meiji shrine in Tokyo. The shrine, which is a place of devotion to Emperor Hirohito's grandfather, is the center of the nationalist Shinto cult. Under General Douglas MacArthur the Shinto faith was cut off from government support in 1954, and the present Japanese constitution grants equal rights for all religions. On these grounds the National Christian Council of Japan protested President Eisenhower's plan to visit only the Shinto shrine. Equal rights for all religions would be violated, they said, unless the President either canceled his visit to the Shinto shrine or included shrines of other faiths in his visit.

Someone more sensitive than the President to the possible slights involved in plans such as his would probably have foreseen, and thus forestalled, the objections. As things stand now, many Americans will consider the objection somewhat foolish. After all, President Eisenhower is a Protestant, and it is not likely that his visit to the Shinto shrine will be regarded as a special favor for the Shinto faith. What the objections reveal, however, is that at least some Japanese Christians feel very strongly the symbolic character of the Presidency.

But among those who would regard as foolish the objections of the Japanese N.C.C. are men who themselves probably have similar attitudes about the symbolic role of the Presidency in the U.S. This is not to suggest that they should now regard their own attitudes lightly; these attitudes are often deeply held even if they are only vaguely recognized. What does suggest itself, however, is that the symbolic role which has been given to the American President is a complex matter that can lead to easy misunderstanding.

Constitutionally the private religious beliefs of the President are a matter of indifference; historically they have been matters of great importance and controversy. The result is that many Americans have come to regard Protestantism as the only "proper" religion for the President. Now that a Catholic President seems at least a realistic possibility the accepted symbolic role is becoming blurred. But this is probably a gain rather than a disadvantage. For the result should be to diminish the public importance which has been given to the President's manner of worship.

SECRET CARDINALS

WHEN Pope John not long ago named seven new cardinals, he announced that he had elevated three additional cardinals *in petto*—a term (literally, "in the breast") signifying the discretionary right of the Pope to appoint cardinals and inform the Sacred College in consistory that he will reveal their names at some time in the future. At the time of Pope John's action it was widely assumed that the three cardinals he had named in this way were bishops in the Iron Curtain countries and that he had withheld their names to protect them from possible Communist reprisal.

But maybe this explanation was too obvious and reasonable. An item in a recent issue of *Christianity Today*, a fundamentalist Protestant bi-weekly, offers another, rather more exotic theory. "According to current canon law," *Christianity Today* told its readers, "to be a cardinal one must first be a priest. The Pope, however, is not necessarily bound by canon law. There is some speculation that precedent-setting Pope John XXIII may have named a layman."

There's no denying that this is an exciting idea, and we would certainly not deprecate the knowledgeability of *Christianity Today's* editors, but we feel bound to observe that to us it seems extremely unlikely. We can further report, if it will help to allay whatever anxieties these gentlemen might feel, that we've made a little survey and we're quite convinced it isn't anybody *we* know.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America on Trial

Unwilling to face the truth, many of us blame anti-American outbreaks on ignorance, ingratitude, envy or the Communists

by DONAL O'MAHONY

THERE is something to be said for an occasional flare-up of anti-Americanism, such as we had a short while ago in Egypt and Iraq and have at present to contend with in Castro's Cuba. Naturally, we'd rather not see these eruptions, but at least they bring us face to face with problems we often forget. Chief of these is the problem of trying to "live happily or safely as an oasis of prosperity in a desert of misery"—the phrase is Secretary Dulles'.

It is certainly not America's wish that other peoples should have to live in a desert of misery. But this description of their plight is an accurate one, the peril to our oasis is very real, and so is the anti-Americanism that rises in clouds from the great desert around us.

Unwilling to face the whole truth, many Americans blame these outbreaks on ignorance, ingratitude, plain envy, or the Communists. But there is more to it than that. Note, for instance, how in Latin America the people of the United States are liked but the U.S. itself is not. (The Eisenhower goodwill tour didn't change a thing.) In Europe they love and admire America but are not equally enamored of Americans. In Asia our standing varies from country to country. In Africa we barely matter (except along the Mediterranean, where resentment flares whenever we throw our weight on the side of the colonial powers). Even so, we cannot count on an African vote at the U.N. They're more likely to be against us.

How puzzling foreign affairs can be, and how baffling for an emerging nation! An emerging nation like the new African states? No, I mean the U.S. It is only twenty years since America began to emerge from twenty years of isolation, and it has not yet quite caught up with the world around it. To speak plainly, I think that from the President on down the people of America—the people of the oasis—have small knowledge and little understanding of the people of the desert.

Pretty well everybody in America has, I would say, some understanding of the fact that the world's in a mess. People can hardly bear to scan the news from abroad; it's nearly always bad. The Communists, when everybody thought they had been stopped, take over Tibet . . . Nasser sets off the explosion in the Gaza strip . . . Cuba makes the headlines when it should be cutting cane. But what many Americans do not seem to understand is that the whole world is in turmoil.

Right now, three continents are in the grip of about eight different revolutions. They're "catching up," "jumping the centuries" from feudalism or colonialism to modern times. Men whose fathers used shells for money have had to draft a nation's budget, and public projects the old colonial rulers failed to tackle have now to be tackled by native rulers whose political experience was confined to agitation. In a dozen fields, they have to do in a decade what the West took many painful centuries to do. At the very least, they have to cram into this decade one whole century of progress. This would get some of them from, say, 1600 to 1700; others are leaping from Abraham's time to Charlemagne's. This is not the least exaggeration; I've lived in the sixteenth century—in a little village in China, fifteen miles from the nearest road, where every sheaf of rice in the valleys around us was harvested with reaping hooks exactly as it was done in Charlemagne's day, and even in Abraham's.

AMERICA's security, if not indeed its survival, is at stake in a global struggle not for territory, as in the old days, but for the hearts and minds of men. And the issue may be decided in the "desert." This is something that most Americans have not yet quite accepted.

A hundred countries have a per capita income of

Father O'Mahony is editor of *The Far East*, published by the Columban Fathers at St. Columbans, Nebraska.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$100 or less, compared with an average of more than $2,000 in the U. S. Further, and more important, the most they can hope for in improvement in the next decade is an annual increase of one per cent. And by then they will be so far behind the "have" countries that their national budgets will be no more imposing, by comparison, than an annual report put out by U. S. corporations today. (The U. S. spends far more on blackbird control than India does on roads, for instance.) The "have-not" lands have one thing, though —the balance of people—1,250 million of them. If any great bloc of them swings to the Communists, the world situation will be drastically altered.

To an extent America, by its military strength and by much patient and sound diplomacy, has saved these countries from falling to Communism. Nehru and Nasser have contributed, too (more, perhaps, than we realize). We have closed many gaps through which Communism could have entered (although currently we talk most about closing the missile gap). But the gap—so wide as to be a chasm—between our (or Europe's) standard of living and that of two-fifths of mankind, may in the long run be the most crucial of all, and this is the gap that has hardly been touched.

The economic and technical programs carried out by the U. S. have been—I quote a 1959 study prepared by the Senate's Committee on Foreign Affairs—"a mixture of emergency measures, palliatives, and efforts to strengthen allies for primarily military reasons . . . the need for a more ambitious, longer term and more pointed direct approach, on a basis broader than U. S. programs alone, can clearly be seen." We have given priority to the military and economic build-up of Western Europe and the countries allied with us on the periphery of Russia and Red China. Rightly so, I would say, since there had to be a military "containment" of Communism. But our problem now is to strengthen, economically and politically, the vast areas back of the periphery; and that brings us to the build-up of the so-called "uncommitted" nations. We have found ways and means to help "committed" nations—their problems could be measured in terms of the country's value in the fight against Communism (a very unsatisfactory way of measuring them). We have not, however, found an adequate formula for making a decisive frontal attack, in a joint effort with a government, on the internal problems that beset the "uncommitted," "have-not" nations.

I am afraid that American leadership will be empty of content for most of these "have-not" nations unless its characteristics are those of a Good Samaritan and a wise physician in the fight against misery. The accent should be on their development, not on defense (theirs or ours); and diagnosis must precede development. Diagnosis, admittedly, will not be easy. The doctor will have to hold a gun on Russia while attending to his patients. And many of their diseases are enigmas to him. Many of the clients, moreover, have quarantined themselves. They have posted a sign at the door: "Help—but stay out!"

It is true that differences vanish as men face the same risk of extinction. With the appearance of eight-thousand-mile missiles and the hydrogen bomb, everybody's interdependence has been doubled—but five hundred years of extractive colonialism cannot be forgotten overnight. We must remember this. It will explain much, but particularly the weakness and the sullenness of many of the patients. We might even come to realize that even so good a thing as free enterprise—as it operates between a weak nation like Cuba, for instance, and a vastly stronger nation, like the U. S.—has almost as much ruthlessness in it as the genuine "economic colonialism."

LATIN AMERICA is, perhaps, the continent par excellence of "economic colonialism." It is an even better example, however, of the sins of incompetent native governments, the futility of palace guard revolutions, the betrayals that selfish, semi-feudal aristocracies can perpetrate on their own peoples. Latin America suffers from so many self-inflicted wounds that you would wonder sometimes where in all its vast body there was room for the "Colossus of the North" to thrust a dagger. But room there was. Not a single one of its twenty countries escaped exploitation in the rough and tumble of world trading—into which they had to venture, unprepared, after the collapse of the Spanish trading monopoly.

Our policies for Latin America will have to be devised with extreme consideration for the hemisphere's weaknesses, and with real humility. "There are no 'experts' on Latin America," holds Herbert L. Matthews of the New York *Times,* "only degrees of ignorance." He adds: "The importance of the region is only equalled, except for specialists, by our ignorance of it. . . . Here is a world at our doorstep on which, to a considerable degree, we depend for our existence as a world power . . . yet our foreign policy interests, expressed in the cold war, are directed far more to Europe and Asia."

Latin America has more than 130 million people, and a birth rate greater than Asia's. It covers a greater area than the U. S. and Canada. But reduce its geographic proportions until they are in scale with its economic position in relation to the U. S., and you make a shocking discovery. Latin America, in terms of its gross national product, shrinks almost to a Texas-size appendix to America north of the Rio Grande. There would be no land on this map south of Mexico City! (Do the same with Africa and Asia, and your new image of the world won't resemble anything shown in a Rand McNally atlas.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I asked a good friend of mine, a political scientist whose opinion I value very highly, to sum up the inner attitude of Latin Americans toward the U. S. "I can put it in a word for you," he said. "They think of us as carpetbaggers." I checked my dictionary later for the precise meaning. It ran: "A Northerner who went to the South after the Civil War, esp. to make money by taking advantage of unsettled conditions." The last part of it cuts deeply.

Currently, the U. S. is pumping about one billion dollars a year of all kinds of help into Latin America. That's counting everything, so far as I can check. It's an improvement over the past, but still far too little. It isn't enough just to prime the pump. Three billions annually would be more like it, and if we can spend five billion dollars on a steel strike, surely the economy of the U. S. can stand doing as much for the continent on which "we depend for our existence as a world power."

On his return from Latin America, President Eisenhower stressed that "self-help" comes first. Granted, but recall the economic image of a continent shrunk to the size of Texas. "Self-help" won't get this little continent very far unless it is multiplied by what the U. S. can do to help. And we cannot depend on the wisdom of the U. S. private enterprise to substitute for the United States itself. Private enterprise's first interest, as all men know, is profits, and in this case, take-out-quick profits. Of its nature, it is extractive rather than constructive.

Turning to Africa, the American role in African development has been far more limited than in Latin America. Official figures show that from 1945 to 1955 the U. S. gave away about $46 billion, of which Africa received $71,595,000 or 0.15 percent—another blackbird control figure. It also received U. S. loans to the value of about $343 million or 2.12 percent of the total of U. S. loans made during the same period. South Africa and the Rhodesias got about two-thirds of the loans (these did much, incidentally, to make South Africa safe for apartheid, which goes to show how objective free enterprise can be about a thing called democracy). South Africa, of course, is the one semi-industrial country in Africa.

THE FUTURE, in my opinion, may depend on how we help three countries: India, Egypt and Brazil, for these are the keys to three continents. Egypt is more precisely the key to the Afro-Asia landbridge, an area in which continuing economic advance is the basic requisite for political and social advance, and perhaps for world peace. Here, too, economic advance —the sobering load of it, and the hopes it would contain for social justice—might even spark Arab federations that would make for stability. But I wonder if there's much use today pointing out that Egypt needs lavish help from us. Neither the Democrats nor the Republicans, I'm sure, will include Egypt as a plank in their election-year platform. Yet for world peace and a bloodless victory over Communism, we must think realistically about Egypt, the question mark hooked onto three continents.

We have been making a number of mistakes in our treatment of other nations. Here are some of them: 1) sloughing off the "uncommitted" one-third; 2) weighing the world situation in terms of stability, when it should be thought of in revolutionary terms; 3) thinking in public relations slogans when we should be going to the root of other people's problems; 4) planning policies to "contain" Communism, when we should be competing with it in a non-bloody manner with every ounce of our strength; 5) thinking of democracy as a conservative thing, when it is actually so revolutionary that it is frightening (Africa's revolutionaries, for instance, are the products of mission, or Western, schools); 6) thinking in free enterprise terms, when we should be thinking in terms of social justice; 7) thinking that $40 billions plus of military spending will solve the problems of defense and stability, even though only $2 millions plus are allotted to the total non-military complex of problems; 8) defining other people's national business in terms of our national business.

We are, it would seem, as the Russians think, "reactionaries." Yet the need, I repeat, is for a revolutionary approach. Not only is the world in a mess, it is in a storm. We must produce, both at home and abroad, men who can ride the storm. This is the only road left to peace. And this means we must be more, not less, revolutionary than the Communists. We have to attract history to our side.

Wishing to advance, and preferably at a rapid rate, some poor countries, particularly ones like India, Indonesia and Egypt, will be tempted to come up with their own combination of the Communist system and ours. This is something we will have to make allowances for. But this is not to say we should underestimate the institutions of democracy. They remain the best gifts we can offer—if we sustain them with the other gifts in our treasuries of ideals, capital and skills.

It may be that victory will not go to those who can inflict the most, but to those who can endure the most. Perhaps, this time, our Athens will prove stronger than the enemy's Sparta. It may be that the swing of the scales will be decided by a small country, or by the millions of victims now behind the Curtains. We cannot tell. The future is hidden. All we can be certain of is that the survival of freedom in the twentieth century will depend not just on missiles or wealth, ultimately, but in the way we make use of all our resources—our richest resource being that of the spirit.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NO ROOM AT THE TOP

LEST THERE be any doubt, let it be spelled out in black and white: the collapse of the summit was a disaster. It was bad enough that Khrushchev behaved as he did. But that should not have been totally unexpected, for when one is dealing with the Russians, it is well to be prepared for anything. What was most disturbing was the ineptness, the blundering, the crude mendacity of the United States in the whole sorry affair. One could not help but feel that if we were going to tell lies, at least we ought to learn how to do it better than that.

Only Mr. Khrushchev's outrageous performance in Paris saved the day for the United States. If he had exercised just a little restraint and introduced the slightest measure of statesmanship, we could have ended up looking like total fools. As it was, though, Khrushchev's own bluster and irrational outbursts finally made us, and especially President Eisenhower, look good by comparison.

The President's fabulous luck, then, held out, and thanks to Mr. Khrushchev, he was given a hero's welcome no less when he returned home, despite the debacle for which he was at least partially responsible. It seems that man just can not lose. The very next day he was back on the golf course, smiling reassuringly from the front pages.

There are those who take a perverse satisfaction in what happened at Paris because they do not believe in negotiating with the Russians under any circumstances. I would not like to put myself in their corner, because I see no alternative to negotiations except war. But to accept this does not necessarily mean that one endorses the summit conference method of negotiation.

The summit notion may seem quite proper to dictatorships where one man—a Hitler, a Stalin, a Mussolini or a Khrushchev—can say *"Moi, je suis l'état."* No American President can, or should, accept a position at the international conference table with such an understanding of his office. In the first place, his authority is not all that absolute; it is bound in by a whole network of Constitutional restrictions. In the second place, his term of office is limited in time and he can not pledge his successors to specific policies. Finally, he should not gamble with the nation's prestige by making it dependent on his own performance.

What would have happened if the Paris conference had not been a summit meeting at all but a gathering of professional diplomats? I can not imagine any worse outcome and find it easy to believe that some progress would have been made. Traditional diplomacy, even among its totalitarian practitioners, operates within an established context, with its own rules and regulations and mode of behavior, and with the opportunities for propagandistic grandstand-plays much more limited. Goldfish-bowl diplomacy, on the other hand, is fraught with dangers. The summit conference provides the totalitarian leader with a world stage, the dream of every propagandist, and it is inevitably seen by both sides not so much as a way of ameliorating the cold war but of winning it.

The emphasis in recent years on the personality of the nations' leaders strikes me as extremely precarious. Are our relations with international Communism dependent on whether Mr. Khrushchev is, or is not, a "nice guy"? He could be the sweetest old man in the world and the system of government he upholds would still be monstrous. Is America's leadership of the free world so dependent on the famous Eisenhower grin? Is it so crucial that we think well of—or for that matter that we hate—Mr. Khrushchev's public manner, or that the Russians join the world in liking Ike? Who started this popularity contest, anyway?

In the years ahead, one way or the other we are going to have to deal with the Soviets and they with us and both of us with Red China. Our leaders may or may not find themselves personally drawn to each other. Another Harry S. Truman may like another old Uncle Joe. In the last analysis, it is irrelevant whether he does or does not. The relevant fact is that our systems—if one can use that mild word to distinguish between antithetical concepts of man and the meaning of existence—are irreconcilable. Mutual annihilation is always possible but, from everyone's point of view, undesirable. Competitive coexistence is a precarious possibility for which there is little to be said except the one thing that is most important of all: with it, mankind will continue to exist.

Coexistence does not mean that black will become white or that wrong will become right. At best it means that diplomatic methods will have to replace military methods as the way of settling disputes. But diplomacy by world figures burdened by enormous personal prestige and national symbolism is a contradiction.

The Paris fiasco just possibly may have been a fatal blow to the international personality cult. I hope so. Mr. K. says he will be ready to try again in another six or eight months. When that time comes, I hope that whoever our President is, he will tell Mr. K. we have a corps of professional diplomats to handle our diplomatic problems and will be pleased to send as many as he thinks his men require to get down to serious business. Let him broadcast his propaganda on his own time.

JOHN COGLEY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Negroes in the South
are marching toward a vision

A Peaceful Army

by NAT HENTOFF

JOHN ADAMS WROTE to Thomas Jefferson in 1821: "Slavery in this Country, I have seen hanging over it like a black cloud for half a Century. If I were as drunk with enthusiasm as Swedenborg or Wesley, I might probably say I had seen Armies of Negroes marching and countermarching in the air, shining in Armour. I have been so terrified with this Phenomenon that I constantly said in former times to the Southern Gentlemen, I cannot comprehend this object; I must leave it to you. I will vote for forceing no measure against your judgments. What we are to see, *God* knows, and I leave it to him, and his agents in posterity."

Since February 1, armies of Negroes *have* been marching and countermarching in the South, but they have been students on the way to lunch counters, public libraries, and jail. Skeptical beyond patience of the judgments of both the Southern Gentlemen and the Northern Congressmen, they have taken the lead in creating mass direct-action protest against entrenched segregation.

The facts of the sit-ins have been widely reported. Worth examining now are the likely long-range effects of the movement (and everyone involved, from Martin Luther King to the students, calls it "the movement" with a pride in stubborn collective strength that would have been familiar to early Christians and beleaguered unionists thirty years ago). The sit-ins have shaken up the Negro middle class throughout the country; have effectively changed the Negro's self-image; have galvanized white college students into action on a mass scale for the first time since the thirties; have startled white Southerners into an involuntary recognition of the reality of "race relations"; and have underlined the importance of the first major Negro organization entirely led by Negroes and based in the South—The Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

As for the change in the Negro middle class, the Reverend James Lawson, thirty-one, expelled from Vanderbilt Divinity School as a leader of the Nashville sit-ins, has pointed out: "This movement is not only against segregation. It's against Uncle Tom Negroes, against the N.A.A.C.P.'s over-reliance on the courts; and against the futile middle class technique of sending letters to the centers of power. We have the Negro middle class with us now, but if we had asked for their support *before* we acted, they would have told us not to demonstrate. Most of them are happy now, but almost none of them understand how it happened."

In the same city of Nashville, I heard Robert Lilliard, one of the Negro lawyers defending the Nashville students, talk to one of the many mass meetings that have taken place all through the South this spring. Almost always held in churches, the meetings are attended mainly by adults—domestics, laborers, professionals. A few students come, generally as an example for the others of fear that has been conquered.

During a rush by Negro businessmen with bail money for jailed students, a judge asked Lilliard, "Are *all* the Negro lawyers of Nashville representing the defendants?"

"Every one!"

"That's the finest spirit of stick-togetherness I've ever seen in this community."

"Me too, your honor."

Some of the adults still have to be pushed. Montgomery, Alabama, has become a bitter city in which communication between white and Negro has almost ceased, except for the continuing efforts of a very few whites who have refused to be intimidated. The Negro community, on the other hand, has been—with some exceptions—convinced of its collective strength ever since the successful bus boycott. The sit-ins there, led by students at all-Negro Alabama State College in Montgomery, have re-animated the adults but probably did not surprise them as much as similar movements did in Negro communities in other Southern cities.

EVEN IN Montgomery, however, some Negroes remain afraid. The night I arrived, I took a cab (white driver, since no white can take a Negro cab) to the Reverend Ralph Abernathy's home. Since Martin Luther King moved to Atlanta, Dr. Abernathy has been the generally accepted leader of Montgomery Negroes. His home has been bombed, and now a glaring spotlight plays on it all night long. "Go ahead," the cab driver

Mr. Hentoff, a former editor of *Downbeat*, recently returned from an extensive trip through the South.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said cheerily as I got out, "go ahead and get shot." Mrs. Abernathy peered carefully through the front door before I was let in. Dr. Abernathy is stocky and often impassive-looking. Unless he is preaching or addressing a meeting, he tends to move and speak slowly. He comes from Marengo County, Alabama, some hundred miles down into the 'black belt'. His father had his own five-hundred-acre plantation. Dr. Abernathy recalls with evident satisfaction, "I never worked a day for a white man." A former teacher of sociology at Alabama State, Dr. Abernathy is in charge of the First Baptist Church, president of the Montgomery Improvement Association, and a key aide of King in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

"We still," Dr. Abernathy said later that night, "get very little open support from the Alabama State faculty. It's a State-supported school, and they're afraid. My congregation has fallen off in recent weeks. Oddly, it didn't fall off during the bus protest; but now, some of the teachers are not coming. And there are others who are afraid to come because the church might be bombed again."

"What the student movement has done," says Bayard Rustin, one of the leading tacticians of the Negro direct action campaign, "is to have broken the back of professional Uncle Tomism. For years, the Negro middle class in the south has profited from segregation, and many businessmen, doctors, lawyers, school teachers, college presidents have preached quietism. Now almost none of them, no matter how conservative, has dared to denounce the movement. The students have made a tremendous contribution because this professional and business middle class had been a great weight on the Negro in the South." Now that middle class is acting in unprecedented ways. Recently, for the first time in Florida Negro history, a Negro social group, "The Most Worshipful Grand Union of Prince Hall Masons, Florida Jurisdiction," voted money —$5,000—to support mass action against segregation. The funds were to help in the defense of arrested students at Florida A&M.

It would be naive to believe that no fear remains among Negroes in the South, particularly in the depths of Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Georgia. But much fear has gone. Four years ago, Bayard Rustin (currently Martin Luther King's chief lieutenant in the North) wrote in "Getting On With The White Folks" in *Liberation* that "Negro children tend to develop early a basic lack of self-respect . . . Dr. Kenneth Clark . . . who was coordinator of the sociological, psychological and historical research for the N.A.A.C.P. Supreme Court case on school desegregation, demonstrated this lack of self-respect through a dramatic experiment, He asked Harlem children to evaluate a group of dolls. Provided with a white doll, a Japanese doll, and a Negro doll, the children overwhelmingly liked the black doll least." The children of the students involved in the sit-ins will not react the same way.

THE VANGUARD of student organization in the South is being taken over by Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The New York-based CORE (Congress of Racial Equality) is helping considerably with advice and workshops, but the students have one key symbol of leadership—King. Dr. King left his Montgomery church this February to head the Conference full-time at its Atlanta headquarters.

The organizational meeting of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference took place in Atlanta on January 10-11, 1957. The Montgomery bus boycott had proved unprecedentedly successful in dramatizing the power of nonviolent resistance against segregation, and King himself had already become a personal symbol. Bus protests had extended to several other Southern cities, and it was clear that the time had come to organize what was at first called the Southern Negro Leaders Conference on Nonviolent Integration. A major help in drafting the call to Southern Negro leaders was Bayard Rustin, a long-time pacifist, associate of A. Philip Randolph, and founding member of CORE. For that first 1957 meeting, sixty Negro leaders came to Atlanta from ten Southern states. The name was later changed to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. King and the others realized that in the South, the majority of Negroes still turn to the church for leadership. It was logical—and would also blunt at least some Southern white resistance—that a movement for integration in the South be Southern-based and composed largely of Southern ministers.

Membership in the Conference is through affiliates. One joins such affiliates as the Montgomery Improvement Association or the Alabama Civic Affairs Association in Mobile, and thereby is also part of the Conference. Current objectives, aside from teaching nonviolence, include relentless emphasis on the fact that the right to vote is the Negro's fundamental civil rights objective. The Conference has helped set up registration clinics and has been acting as a clearing house to strengthen local voting efforts. Where necessary, potential voters are taught to read and write. And increasingly, Negroes are encouraged to register in small groups with a minister in attendance, a less traumatic experience than facing a hostile registrar alone.

One of the previous projects in which the Conference had cooperated were the Youth Marches on Washington for Integrated Schools in 1958 and 1959. There were still memories of the Marches among Southern Negro students with whom I talked; and it seems evident that for some the Marches were one of the catalysts for this year's action. The largest number of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

students in the Marches came from those states whose demonstrations were to prove the most effective in dramatizing segregation. Martin King, for example, sent a group of Alabama State College students to Washington on a bus, and among them was Bernard Lee of Norfolk, Virginia, who this year became the leader of student sit-ins in Montgomery.

IN CONTRAST to Lee, the key adult leaders of the movement are not only intellectually as well as emotionally committed to nonviolence, but some have proved that their commitment transcends the racial issue. Rustin has been active in international appeals to end bomb-tests, and like the Reverend James Lawson of Nashville, has worked in the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Dr. Lawson is likely to become one of the two or three most influential Negro leaders in the South. A pacifist at eighteen, he was a conscientious objector during the Korean War, serving a year in jail, and he lived in India from 1953 to 1956. A thorough believer in the principles of Gandhi, he is exceptionally intelligent, a first-rate organizer, and a tough, resilient fighter (nonviolently). He was instrumental in the formation of the Nashville Leadership Council in 1958, the only affiliate of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference organized so far—he notes proudly—with the explicit purpose of teaching the techniques of nonviolence. Before the February sit-ins began, Dr. Lawson had already helped train several students and adults in the principles and practice of nonviolence and had conducted test sit-ins in Nashville in November and December, 1959.

Dr. Lawson explains: "One of the things these sit-ins are saying is that if we wait—as some Negroes as well as whites tell us to—all of Africa will be free before Negroes break even the major shackles of segregation." Later, at the Shaw University conference on Easter weekend, Lawson spoke contemptuously of *Crisis,* the monthly publication of the N.A.A.C.P., as the magazine of the "black bourgeois club." Unlike King, Lawson is not especially diplomatic.

Increasingly, in some sections of the South, white students have been demonstrating with the Negroes. White students have joined the sit-ins in places such as Wake Forest and Tallahassee; and elsewhere in the country "the movement" has gained more and more campus enthusiasts. On April 22-23, fifteen hunderd student body presidents assembled in Washington for a National Student Conference on the sit-ins. It was organized by the National Student Association which claims to speak for 1,200,000 in 375 colleges and universities. The N.S.A. has also been working for scholarships for the expelled Negro students, has helped organize widespread picketing in the North, and has mailed information about the sit-ins to colleges throughout the country. Also active for the "movement" has been the National Student Christian Federation, which includes the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A., and independent campus groups organized from Harvard to the University of California at Berkeley.

James Robinson, executive secretary of CORE, feels that once having been moved to action by the sit-ins, many students are likely to take a much greater interest from now on in over-all community action. "In recent years, radical campus movements have not been successful, but now—demonstrating for integration—students have found something that is down to earth, has human appeal, and brings visible results. Some students are still pretty romantic and think all Negroes are wonderful and the like, but at least this movement is getting them to *do* something."

From the evidence so far, Robinson is being more hopeful than realistic. Despite the picketing and fund raising; despite such intra-college discussion groups as Challenge; and despite the small but growing interest among some students in the techniques of nonviolence as applied to protests against nuclear testing and germ warfare, there is as yet little indication of significant change in the colleges. It is precisely because the sit-ins have "human appeal" and that support of them brings "visible results" (if only in seeing a Woolworth's become nearly empty) that the students have acted. But the serious reappraisal of our society as a whole that Paul Dubrul of N.S.A. hopes for has not yet occurred to any discernible extent.

Among Negro students in the South, however, the intensified feeling of dignity and self-confidence *has* resulted in what may be a marked change in the previous pattern of the emigration of Negro college graduates to the North. Having begun to win their manhood at home, they may stay for the harvest.

ANOTHER TANGIBLE, and lasting, result of the sit-ins for the Negro community as a whole has been its realization of its economic power. According to the United States Chamber of Commerce, American Negroes have a buying power of eighteen billion dollars. As the Norfolk *Journal and Guide* pointed out in an editorial at the end of February: "A sizable slice of this buying power is spent in the types of stores at which the sit-down protests have occurred." In many Southern cities, the Negroes control as much as half the purchasing power of the total community.

The Negro press meanwhile has noted with satisfaction that Woolworth's sales dropped 8.9 per cent nationally in March and that the Kress stores are hurting in the South. Boycotts are also beginning against individual manufacturers. Several Negro women's groups are boycotting Playtex, for example, because its president was quoted as saying that Negroes weren't ready for integration. The N.A.A.C.P. has called for boycotting all chains that discriminate, and Martin

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Luther King has asked for "selective buying" campaigns.

Although Dr. King and the N.A.A.C.P. agree on the boycott and many other issues, his Southern Christian Leadership Conference is weakening the N.A.A.C.P. to some extent. King has never publicly criticized the N.A.A.C.P. and has, in fact, given it warm support. He did, however, finally say at the Shaw University Conference on Easter weekend that the sit-ins represent a re-evaluation of tactics by those he calls the "freedom fighters." The move now, he emphasized, is toward "a philosophy of mass direct action. They are moving away from tactics which are suitable merely for gradual and long-term change." Significantly, King admits privately that the Southern Christian Leadership Conference may soon become a national organization with membership open to individuals as well as affiliate groups.

A lieutenant of King is much more outspoken. "The main job now is mass community organization. The courts are secondary to direct action by the masses. The N.A.A.C.P. is not a mass movement nor has it been, until pressured, sympathetic to Dr. King's kind of nonviolence. We have sometimes had to force it into cooperating with us on mass action, as in the Youth March on Washington which the N.A.A.C.P. fought at first. There have been N.A.A.C.P. leaders in the South during these sit-ins who have urged the students to call off the demonstrations and rely entirely on the courts. Many N.A.A.C.P. leaders are afraid of the masses, are afraid of the young, and still believe that the 'race' must be directed by an elite leadership."

The N.A.A.C.P. has nonetheless helped considerably in the sit-ins. It organized a lawyers' conference to explore all possible methods of defending the students against various local retaliations and it has offered to pay fines and to find scholarships for the expelled. It also urges its 1,000 branches and 350,000 members to support the students in every way possible. Yet the N.A.A.C.P. leadership is aware that some of the students' impatience is directed at them. Thurgood Marshall felt, he said, as if he were "going home" when he left for Africa a few months ago to give legal advice to the leaders of Kenya. "But when I heard about the sit-ins," he added, "I realized it was time for me to go *home,* back here." He has been much impressed by "the movement" and is seriously re-evaluating what he considers may have been a previous tendency to "compromise" on matters of legislation.

IT APPEARS likely that the N.A.A.C.P., to sustain its strength, will somehow have to bear more heavily on direct mass action although it was organized, has functioned and has done invaluable work in terms of the courts and legislatures. The Montgomery bus boycott was won legally as a result of a suit the N.A.A.C.P. instituted, and there has been a strong record by members of the N.A.A.C.P. Youth Council —particularly in Oklahoma and Kansas—in the use of nonviolence to desegregate stores. "There's so much work," an N.A.A.C.P. official says hopefully, "that we need a good many organizations, including the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, with whom we have worked and will continue to."

A. J. Muste, a veteran expert on nonviolent resistance, has conferred with African nationalist leaders and Southern students on how they can best use nonviolent techniques. So has Bayard Rustin. The Reverend Ralph Abernathy of Montgomery recently was invited by Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah to speak to the All-African Conference on the Montgomery experience and the sit-ins in general.

At the December 5, 1955 mass meeting that set off the Montgomery bus boycott, Dr. King said: "If you will protest courageously, and yet with dignity and Christian love, when the history books are written in future generations, the historians will have to pause and say, 'There lived a great people—a black people—who injected new meaning and dignity into the veins of civilization.' "

FROM A BOOK OF HOURS

A lumpish Virgin in a cloud
of muffled angels rides
on gold: the praising crowd

are deaths we might have died,
denying grace for grace
the insubstantial tide

absence of time will efface,
or lauds and matins prime,
the hours' annealing pace.

Here spiky halos mime
the presences of love,
the stasis of that climb

in green and cobalt moving on hypostatic red.
The lines our eyes remove

in these clear colors' stead
are tensile filaments
to seem us parented,

kept home from all offense,
or married like this bride:
enceinte, indifferent.

CAROL JOHNSON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SCREEN

THE PAST IS NOW

THE REALITY and the dream, yesteryear and today, and the uncertain remembrance of things past are intermingled in "Hiroshima, Mon Amour" so skillfully that the movie becomes a lyrical poem, absorbing the viewer even when he is not sure of its meaning. This French film, the first feature-length picture of director Alain Resnais, goes even farther than Sweden's Ingmar Bergman ("Wild Strawberries" *et al.)* in evoking the timelessness of time as caught in the prose of Virginia Woolf and Marcel Proust. Resnais takes it for granted that his viewers are thinking people —and think they must throughout, beginning with the opening scenes which show the two main characters, a French actress and a Japanese architect, in bed: the glistening close-ups of these two are interspersed with horrifying documentary shots of the Hiroshima holocaust. Set in modern Hiroshima, the film, which Resnais directed from an imaginative script by Marguerite Duras who wrote the original story, is mainly concerned with the woman, and after the first startling love-versus-death scenes, it reveals her background bit-by-bit, not in chronological order but in psychological sequence. Her first love affair, with a German soldier during the Occupation, ended with his being shot and her being shorn and ostracized as a collaborator—a traumatic experience from which she is perhaps only now freed by her Japanese lover.

Although these lead roles are portrayed with unusual sensitivity *and* strength by a new French movie actress, Emmanuelle Riva, and an established Japanese star, Eiji Okada, "Hiroshima, Mon Amour" is distinctly a director's picture. Almost as important as the two actors portraying the lovers are the buildings (both exteriors and interiors) and the streets of Hiroshima and Nevers which Alain Resnais uses so effectively, with the help of the sound track, to bring time past and time present together. So well does Resnais fuse the visuals with the sound track that the two become one and frequently overlap with the sounds of one scene bringing new meaning to the visuals of another. When the film's meanings are not clear, the fault lies with the script which, perhaps purposely, omits details that would guide the audience. Both the Japanese architect and the French actress insist they are happily married, but the film, which has excellent English sub-titles, gives no clue as to how these two met or how they feel about their adulterous affair in relation to the absent wife and husband. Perhaps "Hiroshima, Mon Amour" is to be viewed like "Suddenly, Last Summer" as a symbolic exercise in guilt and evil. The French actress confuses her Japanese lover with her early German lover; and when she is asked what Hiroshima meant to her in France, she replies it meant the end of the war and then a new fear followed by indifference. In spite of the harrowing documentary shots of the Hiroshima disaster, I don't believe the film intends to be anti-American; it is anti-war and definitely anti-A-bomb. For my money, "Hiroshima, Mon Amour" is the most provocative movie of the year; and however audiences may argue about its moral content and implications, they will agree on its technical brilliance and cinematic stature.

DARRYL F. ZANUCK expects his audiences to work a little too in following his new production, which was filmed in Paris and tells two grim stories (of two love affairs) which become joined by a murder. In a way, "Crack in the Mirror" is a trick: its three leading actors portray two sets of characters. In the grubby slum area of Paris, Juliette Greco plays a scheming woman who's grown tired of the drunken laborer (Orson Welles) she's lived with for the past few years and plots with her young lover (Bradford Dillman) to kill him. In a fashionable and expensive part of the city, Juliette portrays the mistress of a famous barrister (Orson) whose young assistant (Bradford) has become this Juliette's lover. Although it is easier to watch these six people on the screen than to describe them, the question is: does one particularly want to? None of them is especially interesting and it must be said that this study of their morals, or lack of them, adds almost nothing to a better understanding of mankind—even at its worst.

The script was written by Mark Canfield from the French novel, *Drama in the Mirror* by Marcel Haedrich, which will soon be published here. It is sprightly enough, and Zanuck has given his film a handsome production with a good cast and French flavor that spills over into the racier bedroom scenes. But the characters are so repelling that one watches the double stories with a cool detachment that warms up only when one admires Director Richard Fleischer's adroit handling of his actors and the script's O. Henry finale.

ALSO GRIM, but at least trying to be funny about it, is "The Rat Race," an occasionally humorous comedy about a saxophonist (Tony Curtis) from Milwaukee and a dime-a-dance girl (Debbie Reynolds), both of whom are struggling to make their way in the cruel city of New York. Everything, but everything, happens to this naive boy and cynical girl before they finally realize that two together can survive the rat race better than one alone. The film is based on Garson Kanin's play, which wasn't much on the stage and isn't much in the movies. But the two leads, helped considerably by Kay Medford and Jack Oakie, make the most of the sugar coating on the bitter pill.

PHILIP T. HARTUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Exchange of Views

Catholic Editors and Senator Kennedy

Kansas City, Mo.

TO THE EDITORS: I think John Cogley makes it too easy for himself in his criticism of Catholic editors for their reaction to the famous *Look* statement attributed to Senator Kennedy [Apr. 8]. He paraphrases the statement in this sentence: "Kennedy said that nothing transcends the officeholder's duty to uphold the Constitution." But the full statement, as placed within quotation marks by the *Look* writer, read: "Whatever one's religion in his private life may be, for the officeholder, nothing takes precedence over his oath to uphold the Constitution and all its parts—including the First Amendment and the strict separation of Church and State."

Some of us may have been overzealous in our elaborate dissection of this sentence; no doubt it was appropriate to remind us that Mr. Kennedy's record showed no substantive evidence of a tendency to compromise his Catholicism or to deny the relevance of religion to public life. Moreover, I have some grounds for thinking that the passage quoted by *Look* did not do full justice to Mr. Kennedy's thought as expressed to its writer.

Despite these concessions, I continue to be irritated a bit by Mr. Cogley's ready exegesis of the Kennedy statement. No doubt Senator Kennedy meant what Mr. Cogley says he meant, but he didn't say what Mr. Cogley says he said; his formulation was thoroughly inept and a legitimate object of criticism. If the reaction of Catholic editors was just one more example of ghetto defensiveness, why did *Christianity and Crisis* exhibit precisely the same reaction? Its editorial comment, like my own and those of Donald McDonald, *Ave Maria,* and any number of other Catholic publications, did not accuse Mr. Kennedy simply of failing to acknowledge the supremacy of conscience, but rather of seeming to deny it.

One of the unfortunate aspects of this unhappy episode was the interpretation placed by the secular press upon Catholic reaction to the Kennedy statement. Catholic criticism was taken in some quarters as an attempt to reassert ecclesiastical control over a rebellious son. Was the Catholic press to blame for this? Perhaps to some extent. But I think the misinterpretation rose primarily not out of any hysteria of ours but from the fact that Mr. Cogley's "unassailable theological proposition," that God is to be obeyed before men, is no longer regarded as unassailable, or even comprehensible, in our society. Rather than a truism, it's a lost truth needing to be expounded.

ROBERT G. HOYT,
Editor, *The Catholic Reporter.*

REPLY

Santa Barbara, Calif.

TO THE EDITORS: I am sorry but I still see nothing wrong in Senator Kennedy's statement just as Mr. Hoyt has quoted it. I do see a great deal that is right in it, considerably more in fact than I was able to find in those editorials in the religious press, including *Christianity and Crisis.* It was never my impression that these reactions arose from "ghetto defensiveness." I thought, rather, that they were due to a failure in political intelligence—and I mean to use the word "political" here as the philosophers use it.

Whether Mr. Kennedy meant what I think he meant or what Mr. Hoyt took him to be saying, his statement boils down to this—an officeholder must keep his oath of office as long as he is an officeholder; nothing transcends that obligation for the officeholder. The key words in the Kennedy statement were clearly "for the officeholder."

Suppose the opinion were turned around and the Senator had said something like this: "The officeholder's religious conscience takes precedence over his oath to uphold the Constitution. . . ." Suppose, as a Catholic, he was obliged to take such a position. Then, I would say, neither he nor any other Catholic should be accepted for public office, for the result would be government by men rather than by law. We do not elect princes to run our government; we elect *officeholders.* The rights and duties of their offices are clearly spelled out in the Constitution. When they assume office, they take an oath. They do not swear to act in accordance with their private notion of good and bad, wrong and right; rather, they swear to act in accordance with the law of the land as it is found in the Constitution, and as the Constitution is interpreted by the Supreme Court.

Suppose the officeholder finds that he can not do this and still be true to his conscience? Then, as a man, we would all agree, he would be obliged to resign from office. But that would be his private problem; it would be no part of his *public* obligation. His obligation to the public—which, after all, is what Senator

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kennedy was talking about—is defined by his oath of office, not by his private moral code.

In *De Vera Religione,* St. Augustine put it this way: "Although men exercise judgment on temporal laws when they are making them, yet, when once the laws are set down, judgment should be made not on the laws but according to them." I do not believe it would be torturing the sense of Augustine to paraphrase: "Although officeholders judge the requirements of office when they become candidates, yet when once they become officeholders, they are obliged to pass judgment not on the requirements of office but according to them."

As for Mr. Hoyt's final point; I could hardly disagree with the proposition that lost truths, especially lost theological truths, should be expounded. But I am forced to add that the truth about God's being obeyed before man is not as lost as Mr. Hoyt appears to believe it is. Translated into political terms, it has been preserved most carefully in the Constitution which Senator Kennedy wants to uphold without qualification, and particularly in the First Amendment of the Constitution. Moreover, I am afraid it is my opinion that the "expounding" of it in the religious press after Kennedy's *Look* interview could not have been more inept. As a result of that controversy, there is more confusion today in the public mind about what Catholics mean by serving God before man than ever before. Perhaps this is all due to the thickheadedness of secular journalists, but, more likely, the explanation is to be found in the disquieting old rabbinical saying: "If you want to know what a teacher actually teaches, ask his students what they learned."

Finally, while I have the floor, I would like to add a postscript, though I have already exceeded my fair share of space. It is this: The Catholic editor has no obligation to support the Kennedy candidacy. That goes without question. But isn't it a matter of simple justice that no Catholic candidate should be burdened more than he already is by having to "explain" criticism coming from the church press which seems to imply to all but the most theologically sophisticated readers that Catholic candidates are not truly free to uphold the oath of office?

For a year now, Senator Kennedy has had to carry this unnecessary burden. I can understand how that happened. I can understand how the original Kennedy statement in *Look* triggered off the kind of moralistic analysis that followed it, even though it should have been clear to anyone with a grain of political sense that these comments would be misread as "an attempt to reassert ecclesiastical control over a rebellious son." What I can not understand, and can barely forgive, is that twelve months later, editors responsible for the misunderstanding in the first place still seem to be more interested in criticizing the Kennedy statement than in providing the exegesis for their own misinterpreted remarks about it.

What it comes down to, Mr. Hoyt and gentlemen, is this: when are you going to get Jack Kennedy off the spot you put him on? JOHN COGLEY.

OF NOTE

GAMBLING, MORALITY AND THE LAW

A RECENT PASTORAL letter on gambling, morality and the law by Albert Cardinal Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago, has more than local interest. The complete text of Cardinal Meyer's directive on the subject follows:

There is an effort at this time to encourage and strengthen law enforcement in our city. The Archdiocese of Chicago, its parishes and people wish to do all in their power to make the effort successful.

In that connection the legality of a game of chance conducted for charitable purposes has recently been called into question. For many, many years some of our parishes as well as some of our educational and medical institutions have received donations by these means. By so doing they have followed a practice common to many other groups, both secular and religious, dedicated to the highest and most worthy purposes. We had assumed, along with other religious, health, education, and welfare groups, that the practice of receiving help through "bingo" and other harmless games was not illegal.

Illinois statutes prohibit lotteries. The wisdom of applying these general laws to games of chance for charitable purposes is questionable. It may never have been the intent of the law to forbid games like "bingo" conducted not as a gambling enterprise but more as a fund-raising device, recognized as such by all concerned. For years many good people, and in particular the elderly, have enjoyed this way of supporting various socially helpful and bona fide organizations that work on a not-for-profit basis.

Law enforcement agencies have customarily distinguished between professional gambling for private profit, on one hand, and on the other hand, humanitarian benefits that do not accrue to anyone's personal gain and are conducted under careful supervision and control.

After consultation I have received various legal opinions. The courts whose right it is to explain the intention of the statute have never been asked to make a determination in this matter. The law, in its application, is not clear. We have elected to wait until it is clarified.

The Catholic position on games of chance is well

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Youth Dreams Of The Future: Carmel Dreads It!

Sixteen, pretty and leprous, for her the pitiable condition of the older patients is a fearful dream of her own future.

But Carmel need not be mutilated by leprosy. A new wonder drug arrests the disease completely.

Please help missionaries bring hope and Christ's mercy to the leprous with this drug.

A DOLLAR'S WORTH WILL ARREST A CASE LIKE CARMEL'S.

ALL GIFTS IMMEDIATELY ACKNOWLEDGED

Send any offering you can, to

Rev. Edward F. Garesché, S.J., Pres.

The Catholic Medical Mission Board

Dept. C 8 West 17th Street New York 11, N.Y.

5 reprints *FREE* to new subscribers to

CROSS CURRENTS

a quarterly review to explore the implications of Christianity for our times

Reprints also sold at 25¢ ea., 5 for $1

☐ **TEILHARD DE CHARDIN:** Building the Earth; ☐ **POLLOCK:** Dewey & American Philosophy; ☐ **STURZO:** Historicist Sociology; ☐ **SLEEPER:** Dewey & Religious Experience; ☐ **DANIELOU** on Poverty; ☐ **STEPHANOU** on Religious Language; ☐ **TILLICH:** Art & Ultimate Reality; ☐ **GOUHIER:** The Tragic & Transcendance; ☐ **FRIEDMANN:** Technology & Human Relations; ☐ **AYFRE** on our image-civilization; ☐ **KARRER:** Ecumenical Catholicity; ☐ **BARTH:** The Church between East & West; ☐ **MEINHOLD:** The Protestant & the Council; ☐ **RICHARD-MOLARD:** Proposals for Africa; ☐ **MANNONI:** The Negro's Protest; ☐ **GUARDINI:** Dostoyevsky's *Idiot;* ☐ **MENDE:** Under-developed Countries; ☐ **FRAZIER:** The Negro Middle Class; ☐ **POULET** on Time.

CROSS CURRENTS, WEST NYACK, N.Y.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Zone..... State.....

☐ Enter my subscription ($3.50 a year) ☐ Bill me

☐ Send reprints checked above ☐ Check enclosed

known. We realize that the playing of a game for a prize is not evil, and this is true whether the outcome depends on the player's athletic skill, his intellectual endeavor, or even his good fortune. The thrill of competition, the awaiting of an uncertain outcome or eventuality, is often an engrossing and refreshing recreation. A game of chance or competition can be abused, but the mere possibility of abuse does not make the game itself wrong. The excesses of the few should not preclude the many from the enjoyment of wholesome or unharmful forms of recreation. There has been no abuse in the way that "bingo" games have been conducted in our parish recreation halls. It is not for the reason that bingo can be considered immoral in itself or that a good thing has been misused that my recommendation is made.

Sometimes games of chance which are inoffensive according to our belief are made illegal by our lawmakers. When they are, the Catholic Church teaches that it is our duty to observe the law. The fact that we find nothing harmful in the activity, if it be properly conducted and not carried to excess, makes no difference. Our first obligation is, as good citizens, to obey all laws, and to aid in their enforcement.

Some say that, despite the now dubious legality of games of chance for charity, we would not be molested if we elected to permit the continuance of this form of money-raising. We do not wish to be exempt from any law. Our Catholic faith is founded on recognition of God's law, and thus we have learned to respect all law and those whose duty it is to enforce it. To carry out our responsibilities properly we must use the power and prestige at our command to support the principle of equality before the law. We do not wish to enjoy any privilege that is not enjoyed by all others. In the last analysis such privileges are too dearly bought because they eventually entail a sacrifice of both liberty and justice. Because the game of "bingo" has specifically been ruled illegal, we ask that this new ruling be complied with immediately and that the game not be used in connection with any fund-raising activities.

There is an effort in our city at this time to encourage good law enforcement and to strengthen those civic traditions of which all of us in Chicago can be proud. Lest this genuine interest be diverted from its important objectives into an unfruitful contest over the relatively peripheral and minor issue of "bingo" for charitable purposes, we prefer that the issue not be raised by us. Setting aside any discussion of what the civil law should be in its application, we wish to remove any burden of uncertainty from the shoulders of our civil officials in order that they may set themselves wholeheartedly to the real problems of law enforcement confronting them. Accordingly, I recommend that any Catholic parishes and organizations that have been offering "bingo" games discontinue doing so.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Sun Also Sets

by EDWARD SEIDENSTICKER

Tokyo

PERHAPS because political affairs in Japan are so noisy at the moment, literary affairs seem very quiet. The traditional distrust of the Japanese intellectual for his government has found an attractive issue to focus on, the Security Treaty with the United States, and, long condemned to ineffectiveness, he seems once more to have that giddy feeling as of being at the barricades.

As for the reading public, its attention is on baby manuals and the like. A baby manual has either led or been well up on the best-seller lists for some weeks now. Japan is in the throes of a baby boom, the direct result, it appears, of the Crown Prince's marriage a year ago. New parents of a first-born go around frowning into manuals, because grandmother is no longer kept around to take care of the baby, or poring over lists of famous schools, because it is becoming the case that a child's success or failure in passing the proper kindergarten entrance examinations has a bearing on his whole future.

Yet neither an intelligentsia that has its mind on politics nor a general public that has its mind on babies can be the whole explanation for the quiet. In Japan, as in other places, critics have been telling us that the novel is sick, and they may be right. Autobiography has long been the stock-in-trade of the Japanese novelist, and he seems to have finally become ashamed of it. He no longer has quite the assurance he had twenty years ago that novels about novelists writing novels are the truest and bravest things in the world. But where to go next?

The critics are happy to give an answer or two. One critic, Mr. Nakamura Mitsuo, suggested not long ago a return to a *littérature engagée,* or, as the Japanese call it, a political novel. Another, a confident young critic named Mr. Etô Jun, suggested a Japanese picaresque novel. Of the two ideas, the latter is the more interesting. The Japanese experience with *littérature engagée,* from the "people's rights" novel of the Meiji Period down to the post-war novel of "The People," has not been a happy one. The fiction has been too fragile to bear the weight of the ideas, and the result has too frequently been the slightly fictionalized treatise, a genre whose ancestor is Plato and not Cervantes or Murasaki Shikibu. One does not feel really sanguine about the prospects for a new try at it.

The picaresque idea is more interesting if only because it hits on something that has been rather wanting in Japanese literature. Call it the smell of the rogue, call it simply the sweaty smell of the man who is up to something, one sniffs through modern Japanese letters for it, but in vain. There are no Hucks or Jims, no Augie Marches, not even any Holden Caulfields. Those novel-writing heroes are rather watery figures, and the burden of the fiction rests with their women, to such an extent that one begins to wonder whether Japan, too, is a mother-ridden country. Fine heroines there are plenty of, but there is scarcely enough masculine zest to make a single *picaro.* When the first installment of *Kyôko's House,* by Mishima Yukio, came out year before last, it seemed possible that he had hit upon a good compromise, a novel about not a *picaro* but a *picara.* Unfortunately she disappeared, and young men who were thinly disguised projections of the author took over. The nearest thing I can think of to a picaresque hero is the renegade priest in *The Misshapen Ones,* an unfinished novel by Takeda Taijun. An unfinished novel, be it noted. Mr. Takeda apparently lost his nerve at the moment when his hero seemed ready to give over a life of good-natured malingering for a life of energetic apostasy.

THE IDEA of a picaresque novel, then is not a bad one, but nothing much seems to be coming of it. The most interesting happenings the last year or so have been only peripherally literary. Thus there has been a remarkable revival of interest in Japanese history, which has produced some of the major publishing successes of recent months. It has also produced some of the best recent fiction, notably that by Mr. Inoue Yasushi, who, however, has been concerned less with Japan than with the continent and is at the moment serializing a novel about Genghis Khan.

To people who fear Japanese nationalism, the "history boom" is a bad thing; to people who lament the lack of patriotism in post-war Japan, it is a good thing. No doubt it is a combination of the two, and not immediate cause for alarm. As for Mr. Inoue, he has been remarkably good at evoking the vast spaces and epochs of Asian history; but he has also been good, as few of his colleagues have, at infusing the novel with a certain

Mr. Seidensticker is a teacher and writer now living in Japan. This is his first appearance in The Commonweal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

muscularity, and perhaps it is from him that we may eventually expect that picaresque novel.

Then there is a phenomenon that is of as little literary interest and as great social interest as the Beat Generation in the United States: the Angry Young Men have arrived in Japan. They are perhaps less intellectual than their English fellows, and, like the Beatniks, thrive on sex and violence, or in any case say they do.

Although it is never entirely clear in Japan how much someone is in revolt and how much he merely wants to look avant-garde, the angry young Japanese would seem to be part of a world movement, the revolt against the boredom of prosperity. In the years after the war, sex was an anodyne. Now it has become an end, a way of demonstrating that the individual is more important than all the gadgets, that he can throw them wildly about and break them up.

It is rather sobering, the fact that while at one end of the scale Japanese recovery has not succeeded in freeing everyone from the fear of hunger, at the other—for the young writers in question belong to the privileged classes—it has produced the nihilism that lies at the end of affluent materialism. Mr. Ishihara Shintarô, one of the two accepted leaders of the younger set, is all for rebellion-through-sex. Mr. Oe Kenzaburô, the other, goes him a step further and advocates suicide. Meanwhile the "Trotskyite" student movement rushes for the barricades, and less angry and intellectual young people dream of motorcycles.

BOOKS

At the Center of Political and Esthetic Controversy

BRECHT: THE MAN AND HIS WORK. By Martin Esslin. Doubleday. $4.50.

By BRUCE A. COOK

DURING a recent performance of *The Good Woman of Setzuan* at Chicago's Goodman Theater, a middle-aged man and his wife got up and left, protesting loudly to the stage that they had "never seen such junk before." The audience was properly appalled at the outburst. Had Brecht been there, he would have been delighted.

Always at the very center of political and esthetic controversy, Bertolt Brecht lived most of his life as the *enfant terrible* of the German theater. In the Weimar days, the opening of one of his plays was always sure to cause a scandal of some sort. No less than Gerhardt Hauptmann walked out in a huff at one. Brecht's works were banned by the Nazis; and a virtual interdict was put upon them in the Soviet Union. But in the last three years things have changed. The East and West are singing his praises, and, more important, producing his plays. Death has lent him respectability.

In this fine critical biography (the emphasis is more on the man than his work), Martin Esslin traces Brecht's difficult path from the blind anarchy of his early years in Munich and Berlin, through his first enthusiasm for the rigor and discipline of the Communist Party, then into exile, and finally back to East Berlin, where he made his barter with the Party—his independence for a theater.

Esslin presents a strong portrait of Brecht drawn from an enormous list of commentary, criticism, and personal impressions. It is a picture of a deep and highly complex personality, one of the most fascinating and truly creative of this age. "He could not endure the ugliness and vulgarity of patriotic cant," says Esslin, "the witlessness of respectable society, and the loathsome cynicism of the nouveaux riches. And it is clear that his sensitivity was not esthetic. He was also basically a puritan and an idealist." He wanted to attach himself to some system that might provide a new foundation to replace the rot of the old order. "Marxism, as Brecht understood it, provided such a framework. It allowed all these negative attitudes to crystallize into a positive pattern. And what was even more important to Brecht, it was esthetically satisfying." His commitment to Communism became the central fact of his life, in the theater and out. And Esslin has rightfully given it central importance in this study of the poet's life and work.

But this book is a good deal more than the political biography of a controversial public figure. In an offhand fashion, Esslin throws out some valuable insights into Brecht's work. In his chapter on the playwright as poet, he brings attention to Brecht's blend of language as the source of his dramatic strength. And the keen analysis given the Epic Theater style is distinguished by its simplicity and freedom from jargon.

Finally, Esslin devotes a part of his study to an especially important aspect of Brecht's work: its multiple levels of meaning and emotional response. These effects, largely unintended, are explained by Esslin as results of Brecht's inner conflict between the forces of reason and intuition. This conflict led him into a dilemma of intentions.

"He wanted to be a writer for the common people, as easy to understand as fair-ground comedians, but the simpler he tried to be, the more complex his work became, so that only intellectuals could appreciate it; he wanted to serve the cause of the revolution, but was regarded with suspicion by its recognized standard-bearers, who reviled him as a formalist and banned him as a dangerous, defeatist influence: he wanted to arouse the critical faculties of his audience, but only succeeded in moving them to tears; he wanted to make his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theatre a laboratory of social change, a living proof that the world and mankind could be altered, and had to see it strengthen his public's faith in the enduring virtues of unchanging human nature. He had to witness his villains acclaimed as heroes and his heroes mistaken for villains. He sought to spread the cold light of logical clarity—and produced a rich texture of poetic ambiguity. He abhorred the very idea of beauty—and created beauty."

Human Testimony

NIGHT MUSIC. By Sven Stople. Sheed & Ward. $4.50.

By MICHAEL NOVAK

THE ARTIST of Scandinavia, notably Ibsen in the drama, Bergman in the cinema, and now Stolpe in the novel, frequently has a peculiar, passionate moral earnestness. Stolpe's second novel to reach the English-speaking world has the marks of passion, searing psychological insight, and a ruthlessness with falsehood that belong to a great artistic moralist.

Night Music is the story of the House of Falk. Herbert Falk, former professor, is now Prime Minister of an unnamed country. It is the era of crisis in the West, our own era. In the grey, dirty streets of the cities of his country, the momentum of Communism gains force. Workers achieve through the Party a cosmological insight, and thence a driving enthusiasm. In the home of the Prime Minister himself, the self-deceptions of human love, convention, and traditional idealism create a black whirlpool of falsehood, hatred, and sterility that are an image of the culture that has spawned them. Ibsen did not dramatize more clearly the power of domestic falsity. Bergman does not show more clearly the ultimate restlessness and ironies of life. Stolpe does not match Dostoevsky, but perhaps only Dostoevsky is as full of psychological surprises and so thorough in unmasking layer after layer of the suffering personality.

Prime Minister Falk's private secretary turns out to have been a Communist spy. A huge workers' demonstration and threatened violence necessitate a declaration of martial law. A bitter personal feud has been the cause of an open war of slanders in the press, between Prime Minister Falk and the leading editor of the Catholic Party; coalition government becomes impossible. Falk resigns. His son has turned against him and died with the Communists. His beautiful daughter Regina has long hated his pompous moralisms and has been frankly living a nervous, man-despising, bohemian life. Lady Falk, neurotically ill because she long believed Falk unfaithful in the early years of marriage, has lived as a semi-invalid far from his side.

Even the minor characters become briefly and vividly alive for our compassion: Isabelle, for whom Regina feels an intensely wrought, poetic, unnatural love; Mrs. Graber, once madly inflamed by her image of the severe, idealistic Professor Falk now broken and her marriage ruined by his absurd romantic notions.

The pride and idealism of Falk, the false religiousness first of his son, then of his daughter, for a long time of his wife, even of his political opponent Graber—even of himself—constitute a gallery of portraits of the Catholic conscience. The poor wisdom of the sensual-appearing Friar is a mordant comment on "the poor things of this world that God has chosen," and, beautifully but unostentatiously, the Friar knows it.

In telling his story, Stolpe switches the point of view and the manner frequently. The action moves somewhat in the rapid manner of Graham Greene's melodramas and, in its more psychological aspects, like the emotion-charged penetrations of Dostoevsky. The intensity of the novel's interest in the socio-political gropings of the Catholic conscience is matched only in Bernanos. Stolpe has done so much that the critic will wish that his plot seemed less contrived,

You're invited to

FRIENDSHIP HOUSE

INTERRACIAL CONFERENCES

July 15-17, August 19-21, 1960
at CHILDERLEY FARM, near Chicago

Who?

The ordinary concerned citizen—

. . . priests, sisters,
. . . seminarians, laity
. . . young, old, beginners, advanced

The manner is ordinary . . . but

YOU'LL NEVER FORGET
A FRIENDSHIP HOUSE
WEEKEND of discussion,
reflection, prayer

Participants of former unforgettable conferences say: "I felt a special union at Childerley that I have never felt before." "In spite of all the fun we had, or partly because of it, it was a very profitable experience for the priesthood . . . a better realization of racial problems . . . a better knowledge . . . a lot of good friends." "We came to bear witness to the truth in our small way." "The most inspiring weekend of my life."

To inquire, to apply, or to help finance a worthy applicant, please write: Betty Plank, Friendship House, 4233 S. Indiana Avenue, Chicago 53, Illinois.

(Also—Work and Study Week openings now and the year round.)

College of
Notre Dame of Maryland
Baltimore 10, Maryland

Conducted by the School Sisters of Notre Dame

Fully Accredited

Program leading to A.B. degree
Arts and Sciences

Teacher Training Pre-Medical

For catalog and further information address the Director of Admissions

NEVER TOO LATE TO BECOME A PRIEST!

New seminary exclusively for belated vocations to secular or religious priesthood. Full college course leading to B.A. Degree. *Write to:*

Director of Admissions
HOLY APOSTLES SEMINARY
Cromwell, Connecticut

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature and the Arts

Most widely known as a journal of opinion edited by Catholic laymen and focused on public affairs, The Commonweal is nevertheless highly regarded for the consistent quality of its varied comment on present-day writing and contemporary arts.

Week-by-week the magazine's various critics, here and overseas, present discerning analysis which is itself good reading of a most enjoyable sort. Socio-political articles and editorial comments combine with literary criticisms to form a meaningful whole.

Send the coupon or a facsimile for a half-price trial subscription.

---17 Weeks for $2---

FOR NEW SUBSCRIBERS

THE COMMONWEAL
386 Fourth Ave.,
New York 16, N.Y.

For the enclosed $2 send me the next 17 issues

Name .....

Street .....

City, Zone, State .....
6/10/60

that his dialogue had been more worked, his discussions of faith a little less prolonged and discomforting. Yet perhaps it is only the Hemingway conventions of the recent English-speaking novel that make the critic wary. And perhaps there is room in the American and English novel for explicit excursions into philosophic discussion and moral argument that is not being used. At any rate, Stolpe is clear, forceful, and more than passionate enough to ensure his forgiveness.

Stolpe's work, in fact, invites reflection on the task of the artist who writes from a religious sensibility. So much falsehood masquerades as religion, the embrace that convention and respectability have given religion is so stifling, that it seems only by some method such as Stolpe's—the portrayal of false religiousness struggling for honesty—can a valid human testimony arise. Ibsen destroyed idols and banished ghosts; Bergman achieves suffering intensity in his earnest search; Stolpe tries to destroy, to search, and to find.

Stalinization

AMERICAN COMMUNISM AND SOVIET RUSSIA. By Theodore Draper. Viking. $8.50.

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

IN *The Roots of American Communism,* Theodore Draper presented a masterly analysis of the origins of the Communist Party in the United States. In this second volume, he continues his narrative, bringing the account up to the end of the twenties, and *American Communism and Soviet Russia* lives up to the high standards of its predecessor. It has a richness of historical detail, the sweep of historical analysis.

These days when one thinks of the Communist Party it is with the eyes of the recent past. All the "theses," the long, theoretical articles by the Communist leadership, are merely reflections of decisions made in the Kremlin. The Twentieth Party Congress and the Hungarian Revolution can drive a majority of the membership out of the Party, yet the tiny band holding the political franchise from Moscow continue, struggle back and get on with the work. In such a situation, there is hardly a rich field for analysis. Individual stories, accounts of the impact of the Party line in this or that situation, even personal tragedies, are produced by such a Party. But its political life, in any real sense of the word, is nonexistent.

It was not always so in the American Communist movement, and it is Mr. Draper's great merit to link up the early, heroic period (a time when Communists thundered their intention to overthrow the Government by force and violence) with the later reality. And in terms of this central point, there is considerable paradox. The Communist movement of the twenties was far from monolithic. On the contrary, it was an endless faction fight, a passionate exchange of real points of view. But early in the Party's history, the principle of "appealing" to the Communist International was introduced. Weak, isolated from the American labor movement, the Communists sought their salvation in the prestige and power of the Soviet State and the Comintern.

This attitude developed, it must be emphasized, voluntarily. It was not imposed by the Russians so much as it was sought by the Americans. And, in a series of situations, the Russians actually had a better perspective on the American reality than the indigenous Communists. They rescued the Party from much of its hair-splitting and from some of its messianic sectarianism. There were laughable errors, to be sure, but the intervention in those days was not the simple, mechanical translation of Russian foreign policy into American terms.

In *The Roots of American Communism,* Draper traced the development of this dependence as it emerged in the early days of the Party. In this second volume, a more grim theme appears. The Russians themselves were going through the struggle for power, moving

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1886 1960

Camp Alvernia

CENTERPORT, L. I.

Telephone: ANdrew 1-5730—5731

Conducted by the

FRANCISCAN BROTHERS

For BOYS, 6 to 14. 41 miles from New York City on the North Shore of Long Island. Complete camp program supervised by 30 Religious Brothers who are experienced Educators. Salt water bathing beach. Excellent food. Modern cabins. Season: July 2 to August 27.

$100 for Two Weeks
$190 Per Month
$370 Per Season
$5 Registration Fee

Write or phone for catalogue

Winter address
(Sept. 1 to June 26)
CAMP ALVERNIA
FRANCISCAN BROTHERS
921 Putnam Ave.
Brooklyn 21, New York
Telephone: GLenmore 2-6543

Particularly welcome

Graduation and

Ordination Gifts

A one-year subscription

to The Commonweal, $8

A two-year subscription, $15

Subscription Dept.

The Commonweal

386 Fourth Ave.

New York 16, N. Y.

BARNES & NOBLE, Inc.

105 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N.Y.

Over 1,000,000 Used & New Textbooks of all publishers at reduced prices

toward Stalin's eventual victory. The International was losing every semblance of independence. It was becoming more and more an instrumentality of Russian (that is, of Stalin's) policy. The principle of dependence upon Moscow which the Americans voluntarily accepted in the early twenties was being transformed into the iron law of Stalin's will in every Communist movement in the world. Thus it was that American Communism so "radical," so brawling and ultra-revolutionary in its inception, offered practically no resistance to Stalinization. The principle of outside direction has been accepted. But now "outside" was Stalin.

Perhaps the most fascinating chapter in this study of the process of Stalinization deals with the slogan of "self-determination" for America's Negroes. Mr. Draper here acts the role of the scholarly detective. He traces the incredible documentary trail in Russia whereby *the theory of the Negro nation in* America was worked out by Russians and imposed upon the Party in the United States. And then Mr. Draper also presents glimpses of the men who lived this strange experience: William Foster, the "Americanizing" radical as he is transformed into a puppet of the Russians; Jay Lovestone, an intriguer caught in his own net.

In short, *American Communism and Soviet Russia* will long be a definitive source volume and analysis of the Stalinization of American Communism. It places that process in a rich historical and human context. It gives us a much deeper understanding of how one wing of American radicalism betrayed its mind and soul to a distant dictator.

REVIEWERS

Bruce A. Cook is a free-lance writer who lives in Chicago. He has previously written on Bertolt Brecht.

Michael Novak, a frequent contributor, has written for *America, Perspectives* and *Downside Review*.

Michael Harrington writes on political and cultural affairs for various American journals.

IT MAY NOT BE TOO LATE . . .

to begin studying for the Priesthood with the Priests of the Sacred Heart! If you are a high school graduate under 30 or a college graduate under 40, we have a special accelerated course in Latin and allied subjects which will prepare you for our major seminary. Ex-GI's welcomed in our Veterans' approved course. Want more information? Write: Father Superior, Dehon Seminary, Great Barrington 11, Mass.

Classified

Irish Books and Gifts

• Books, Linens, Gifts, Catalogs
IRISH INDUSTRIES DEPOT, INC.
870 Lexington Ave., (near 65th) New York

Lecture Representatives Wanted

• LECTURE REPRESENTATIVES. Married women with time & ability to develop local, autonomous bureaus to tie-in with established *national organization*. Cities over 300,000. No capital required. Resume, P. O. Box 3215, Grand Central Station, N. Y. 17, N. Y.

Assistant Alumni Secretary Wanted

• ASSISTANT ALUMNI SECRETARY. Personnel or Public Relations *experience preferred*. Some editorial helpful. Must be Fordham alumnus. Forward resume to: Alumni House, Fordham University, New York 58, N.Y.

Southern Mission

• MISSIONARY PRIEST struggling to build church in Ocean Drive Beach, South Carolina. 80 Catholics in a population of 15,000, but with a church. . . . Would you send some help before tomorrow's high tide? Rev. Henry J. Burke, P. O. Box 315, Ocean Drive Beach, S. C.

Advertising

Classified

20¢ a word, 12 words minimum.
Centered lines: $1.20 a line, 2 lines minimum

Time discounts: 5% for 3 times, 10% for 7 times, 15% for 13 times.

Classified Display

$11.90 per inch, minimum
Same time discounts.

Payable in advance except when ordered through recognized advertising agencies.

The Commonweal

386 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N.Y.
MUrray Hill 3-9688

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW CAN WE CATCH THE THIEF IN THE LIGHT?

In broad daylight, the thousand-fingered thief, inflation, goes on stealing from us all.

Turning the glaring spotlight of public alarm on him hasn't even slowed him down. Like a disease, he goes on shriveling the precious dollars we spend today to live, or save for the future.

But are you aware that *even when you pay your taxes,* inflation is there, swindling you! For inflation puffs up the cost of all the countless things the government must buy, too.

Is there no small step a man can take to help catch this robber? Or at least to slow him down? There is. It is based on a simple rule of everyday economics.

Each of us can try to *deserve* more before we demand to get *paid* more. And one way we can do it is by producing more, and better, of whatever we have to offer the world.

This is the first step every man can take to sound, individual prosperity, without inflation.

REPUBLIC STEEL

CLEVELAND 1, OHIO

The road to sound national prosperity lies through sound business developments and product improvement, not through inflation.

One of Republic Steel's important developments in the field of new products, which reduces costs for industry, is X-TRU-COAT*, a plastic-coated steel pipe. Republic is the exclusive manufacturer of this product.

X-TRU-COAT combines the strength of steel with the proven protection of plastic, sealing out corrosion permanently. Thousands of miles of this plastic-coated pipe are now in use throughout the country. Utility companies, for example, find it specially useful because it is immune to corrosive soil conditions—prevents electrolytic action.

*Produced under the Dekoron process.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED